

A Letter to the Lay-Expositor,

CONCERNING

His Exposition of the orthodox system

OF

Civil Rights and Church Power, &c.

In which

The merits of his system are
examined and stated.

Truth and Religion, rejected by the Alliance ; the supports of a Protestant-dissent.

Caleb Fleming

By the Author of the Comment on Mr. Warburton's
Alliance between Church and State.

L O N D O N :

Sold by J. NOON at the *White-Hart* in the *Poultry*, and J. ROBINSON at the *Golden-Lion* in *Ludgate-street*. 1749.

(Price Six-Pence.)

S I R,

I HAVE read your *Exposition of the orthodox system of civil rights and church power, &c.* and have observ'd, that if your pen was not guided by the very hand of Mr. Warburton, you well deserve the reputation of an exact accomplish'd mimic. There is a wonderful agreement in the Spirit of your writings: and the manner of your treating the author of a *piece*, call'd, *A comment upon the Reverend Mr. Warburton's Alliance*, greatly resembles Mr. W—'s treatment of his answerers. This may be seen in your conclusion, which is, — “ For
 “ I should think my time strangely mis-
 “ employ'd, and the Reader's patience as
 “ much abused, to take the least notice of
 “ a thing called a *Commentary on the Book of*
 “ *Alliance*; in which the nameless Writer
 “ has not only proclaimed his profound ig-
 “ norance of the principles of that Book,
 “ (a case pretty general amongst *answerers*) but
 “ of all others principles whatsoever, even
 “ those of his own trade, which is calumny.”
 If you insist upon the greater propriety of the term, *commentary*, than that of *comment*, I will not dispute it with you.—And now
 B let

let me, Sir, be free, in my turn, to tell you that this rude usage of a man, in whom you are not able, in a single instance to fix the charge of *calumny*; is a demonstration of something not very favourable to yourself. As to my profound ignorance of *the principles of the book* of alliance, the reader may judge of it, from the comment itself; as well as from the following remarks on the exposition. And I ask, is there not the effrontery of a hair-brain'd church-man, in this assertion, *viz.* that the comment has proclaimed a profound ignorance in its author, of *all other principles whatsoever*? The principles desecrated by the *Exposition*, would naturally lead to such scandal and defamation; for therein you have eccho'd to the alliance, in excluding *truth* and *religion* from your church-establishment. Therefore the UTILITY of a scandal is sufficient, with you, to warrant and sanctify any measure of *calumny*. The principle of calumny, is not received or admitted in my religion, however it is in the defence of your establishment. This you call *my trade*; yet compliment me with a profound ignorance of its principles! which is much more than I, or any man can say of you, who, by this specimen have shewn you to have a profound knowledge of the principles. —

In this collection of choler, you throw up, — *nameless writer*. — if you design'd it as a stigma of contempt, I would ask why the *Exposition* has appeared under no other name,

than, *by a layman*? — doubtless, you depended upon the reputation of your orthodox System. And, if I mistake not, this *protean* appearance has indulg'd your fondness of offering so much incense to your own shrine. — or, because your reputation has sunk as a *divine*, you have chosen to appear under the more acceptable character of a *layman*.

Thus much is due to you from the cruelty of your thrust at the vitals of my character. — Had you possessed the least degree of humanity, or known the *sacredness* of every man's reputation, you could not have thus intentionally assassinated mine, without any just provocation. For nothing can be more malignant than to say, a man has betray'd a *profound ignorance of all principles whatsoever, even those of his own trade!* — If the world should give you credit, what must be the consequences I may expect from it? — But Mr. *Layman*, assure yourself, that I stand a better chance for credit with the virtuous, than you do: since your Exposition, and your orthodox System, professedly discard *truth*, and turn solely on the hinge of *utility*; a principle that the thief or murderer does daily avail himself of. — This is your plan; and let who will give you credit upon it: I should not chuse to entrust you with any part of my small property.

But one thing more, good Mr. *Layman*; how came it to pass, that your great sagacity should fail you so much, in this your

sovereign contempt of the *comment*? of which say you, “ I should think my time strangely
 “ misemploy’d, and the reader’s patience as
 “ much abus’d, to take the least notice of a
 “ thing called a *Commentary on the book of alliance*.”——If you had behav’d with prudence, and not been imposed upon by your *evil genius*, you would not have taken the least notice, *i. e.* you would not have mention’d the *comment* at all. And I have the vanity to think, that the more ignorant the world is of that performance, the better it may fare with your *orthodox system*, and the *exposition* of it.

Thus far I have been guided by that maxim of wisdom, *answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit*. And I have, at the same time, conform’d to that other, *viz. answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him*: since what I have recriminated, has *truth* for its support; and can boldly appeal to the judgment of the public. It is a piece of necessary self-defence, to disarm a mad-man, who throws about arrows, firebrands and death! tho’ all the while he pretends to be defending *liberty*, as her mighty advocate!——

Farther I would ask you, Sir, aside,——whether that thing called *the Comment*, has not occasion’d the pains you have taken in your *Exposition*? tho’ you have, under colour, directed your Reader’s eye to the performances of Dr. *Stebbing*. But enough of
 this

this—I will proceed to examine your Exposition. You thus address the Friends of the Church, *p.* 76. “ Let them recollect, that
 “ the Church is surrounded with enemies,
 “ ever ready to dispute the reasonableness of
 “ the privileges possess’d by her, and to en-
 “ quire into the grounds and foundation, up-
 “ on which she claims them. Let it be re-
 “ member’d, that the Gentlemen they have
 “ to do with, make no scruple to attack the
 “ Legislature; and to call for the repeal of
 “ laws, when not satisfied with the fitness,
 “ equity, and justice of them. If therefore
 “ we are press’d with objections, it will be
 “ to no purpose to shelter under the sanc-
 “ tion and authority of custom and usage.
 “ If we would offer any thing decisive in
 “ the present question, we must shew that
 “ the privilege in dispute is derived from the
 “ nature and reason of the thing; or that
 “ it is the necessary consequence of an al-
 “ liance between the two societies.” So ap-
 parent is it, that my profound ignorance pro-
 claim’d in the *Comment* has led you to re-
 nounce the sanction and authority of *custom*
 or *usage*; for you know, *Sir*, that the alliance
 you expound has defended the *test law*, upon
 the *Game Law*, and upon that of *prescrip-*
tion. To decide the question in dispute,
 you are to shew, that the *privilege* is derived
 from the nature and reason of the thing; or
 that it is the necessary consequence of an al-
 liance between the two societies.

But,

But, your way of deciding the question in dispute, I fancy will not be sufficient to satisfy the Gentlemen who call for the repeal of laws, when not satisfied with the *fitness*, *equity*, and *justness* of them; unless you could prove that the *alliance* is itself founded on the nature and truth of things, or upon fitness, equity, and justice: and therefore for you to pretend to shew, that the privilege in dispute is derived from the nature and reason of the thing; or that it is the necessary consequence of an alliance between the two societies, is very silly; and not a whit better than sophistical church-declaration. Nor should only the alliance be prov'd to have its foundation in reason and nature, but also the *privilege* in dispute should be shewn to be fairly deriv'd from the reason and nature of the thing.

But what have you done in the Exposition, to shew this? why, verily, in the language of the man you adore, *you* separate *truth* from *utility* in the idea of the church, which has a national establishment, p. 13.

P. 35. You apprehend, " that it will not
 " be easy to vindicate even our own constitution, according to the *Bishop of London's* reasoning; that is, on the simple principle of
 " *truth*." Yea, that " an *establishment* and
 " a *test law* may be considered either as *mere*
 " *utilities*, or as designed to propagate, countenance and support *truth*. In this last light,
 " what has the Magistrate to do with them, since
 " it does not appear, that religion, as such, is his
 " proper

“ proper and direct business, *p.* 21. To assert
 “ the reasonableness of the *test law* upon the
 “ principle of *truth*, would be just as pru-
 “ dent and seasonable, as to prove the being
 “ of a God from innate ideas.” *p.* 64.

Mere *utility* you avow, as the Magistrate’s sole view in an establishment and test law: and I am of opinion, it will by and by be evident, that the Church has no more regard to truth or religion than the Magistrate is suffered to have in your *new system*.

But, *Sir*, what idea can one possibly form of an establishment of religion, the TRUTH of which, is discarded by the alliance? Notwithstanding you make much pother about *religion*, as not the proper, immediate, and direct business of the Magistrate; yet you rave about a Church-establishment, and about an alliance between Church and State! Your church must consequently, be a church without religion. For because Dr. *Stebbing*, and those in the *common system* were for having *religion* one end of civil government; you say, *p.* 33.
 “ It has no real and natural foundation; as
 “ religion is not the proper, immediate, and
 “ direct business of the Magistrate.”

Nay, you further say, “ that if the Magistrate establishes a religion, merely because
 “ he conceives it to be *true*; he does too
 “ assign the Clergy a public maintenance, purely for the support of the *true religion*, or for
 “ the defence of certain opinions, considered, as
 “ *such*,” *p.* 22. a Scheme you reject. This
 you

you found needful to justify the same power, establishing of *English* Episcopacy on this side the *Tweed*, and *Scotch* Presbytery on the other.

More than this you affirm,—“ that the
 “ Magistrate is not supposed to endow the
 “ Clergy consider’d as Ministers of this, or
 “ that religion, but only as they become a
 “ *public order in the State.*” *p.* 71. “ And you
 “ recommend it to the consideration of the
 “ Clergy, whether it will not be most pru-
 “ dent to claim their Revenues on the prin-
 “ ciple above-mention’d.” *p.* 73.

So far, it seems, are the endowments of the Clergy from being matter of *divine right*, as some fanatical Churchmen have dreamed, that to shew your moderation, you say, — “ with
 “ respect to that part of the public proper-
 “ ty assigned for the maintenance of the Cler-
 “ gy, I would know, whether it would not
 “ sometimes be useful to the State, to apply
 “ it to civil purposes; or whether the con-
 “ siderable sums raised on this score, might
 “ not, at certain junctures, be employ’d in
 “ the defence of the State, to the great
 “ advantage of the public.” *p.* 19. Yet, this is the acquisition which the Church has made by pawning her independency, and conferring the high honour of *supremacy*, upon the civil Magistrate. — But sagacious Sir, how does this prove that there has been such a stipulation and contract between the State and Church, as your Alliance? The *State* has yet, you own, a sovereign right of disposal

disposal even of that part of the public property assigned for the maintenance of the clergy. The above declaration is urged in proof of the Magistrate's having regard to the *use* and *service* which religion is of to the state, as the reason of his affording it protection and support.

Another instance of the impression the *comment* has made upon you. for you say that the church's most inveterate enemies seem ready to allow the justice of this plea. *ib.* *

Yet, your *exposition* of the orthodox system, after having excluded *truth* and *religion* from the church establishment and alliance, speaks, *p.* 77. " of an alliance between the two societies form'd upon the common principles of *equity* and *freedom* !"

The expositor is bless'd with no small share of the same *absurdity* which runs through the book of alliance: as appears by his talking of an alliance of *two societies* form'd upon the common principles of equity and freedom. The state and church in alliance are one society, composed of the same individuals; actuated by the same principles; the clergy being no other than what they are, under the Magistrate's appointment.

If we attend to your reasoning, against Dr. *Stebbing*, we shall be told, " that a *religious* society has one peculiar, separate, " and distinct *end*, and so the *civil* too. —

C

" that

* The reader may see this very argument in the comment for the Quakers paying tythes. sect. 31.

“ that we must not look upon civil society in
 “ two different capacities, both as religious and
 “ civil animals; and as intending to provide
 “ both for their religious and civil interests.
 “ But if your observations have any weight,
 “ you say, they must be considered under the
 “ *last character* only.” p. 11. I would here
 ask, that if *one* end, peculiar, separate, and
 distinct is to be considered, as appertaining
 only to each distinct society, how are they
 capable of an alliance? But if they retain,
 notwithstanding the alliance, their peculiar
 and distinct ends; then they remain to all
 intents and purposes *two distinct*, separate so-
 cieties. and the mutual resignations import
 just nothing at all. The alliance is as great
 a *solicism* as can be imagined: for surely
too ends that are distinct and peculiar to church
 and state, can never become the *common prin-*
ciples of equity and freedom, to the two dis-
 tinct and separate societies, that are said to be
civil and religious.

Good Mr. *Layman*, you seem to under-
 stand as little of *Law*, as the Author of the
 alliance does. pray what sense is there in an
 alliance formed between two societies upon the
common principles of *equity* and *freedom*? It
 might surely have sufficed you to have at-
 tempted a proof of the *justice* and *legality* of
 the alliance, without presuming to make a
 chancery decree in favour of it. But do
 you think, that his Lordship, the present
 Chancellor, would make a decree in favour
 of

of any contract, where *truth* was not regarded? would he own it *equitable* that a religious society should make a bargain with the state, as such, or under the merits of a *religious* society; and yet, that the magistrate should not be allowed to grant the privilege stipulated for, from any such consideration of that society? which is the *new scheme* you doat upon.

The common principles of *equity* and *freedom*, require a farther exposition. ——— *Equity*, properly means, a restraint of the rigorous claims of right or justice; in prevention of some apparent injury arising from those rigorous claims. how, is your Alliance founded on the common principle of *equity*? ——— besides, the common principles of equity and freedom, has as great impropriety in it, as to call the court of *common pleas*, the *court of equity*. we often say, the courts of common law, when we speak of the inferior courts; one of which is called the court of *Common Pleas*.

I wish you would explain yourself, and not hastily conclude, that because the author of the Alliance has his chapel so near the hall where the *Lord Chancellor* frequently holds a court of equity; that therefore truly, your favourite alliance is made upon the *common* principle of equity!

What do you mean by the common principles of *equity* and *freedom*? are your two societies at liberty to pursue reciprocally their

distinct ends? may the church in alliance look upon herself at liberty to pursue the end either of the civil or religious society at pleasure? and v. v. may the state do the same? this you deny in your exposition; and affirm, “ that it has been clearly and incontestibly “ proved, by the excellent author of the Alliance, that the Church is a real society; “ and a society, in, and of, itself, sovereign, “ and independent on any other.—So that “ the civil community could not invest the “ Magistrate with church-supremacy.” *p.* 17.

But if this real society, in, and of itself, sovereign, and independent, has made an alliance with the state upon the common principles of equity and freedom: then surely upon the principles of truth, must we conclude church and state remain no longer two societies. but by the alliance must be as truly one society, as *England* and *Scotland*, formerly two separate and distinct kingdoms, are become one kingdom by the union, even that of *Great-Britain*. Nay the church and state are become *more* strictly one by alliance; since it is form'd upon the *common* principles of equity and freedom. whereas by the act of union, some peculiar, distinct and separate articles were stipulated for *North-Britain*: so that one cannot say of *Great-Britain* that the *union* was form'd upon the common principles of equity and freedom. You give an instance of this, *p.* 23. “ The Magistrate has thought
“ fit

“ fit to establish *English* Episcopacy on this
 “ side the *Tweed*, and given it the prefe-
 “ rence to *Scotch* Presbytery. — But
 “ on the other side, he has chose [chosen]
 “ to establish *Scotch* Presbytery, and given it
 “ *the pass* before *English* Episcopacy.”

This has been done by the Magistrate, to whom, you say, your church has resigned her independency, and also invested with supremacy. or, it has been done, by the two societies which are in an alliance, form'd upon the common principles of equity and freedom.—done by the reigning Queen, Lords and Commons. But did not your Bishops concur in this act of union? “ whose only end and purpose of
 “ their sitting in Parliament, you say, Mr. *W.* has declared, is to represent the church.” *p.* 75. And yet, these very Bishops gave *scotch* presbytery *the pass* before *english* episcopacy on the other side the river! To clear yourself, and scheme, you reject the common system, by saying, “ it has no real and natural foundation, as religion is not the proper, immediate, and direct business of the
 “ Magistrate. It is an unreasonable, unrighteous and oppressive scheme.—It blackens and
 “ defames the credit of our own Legislature, as it arraigns the Establishment settled in
 “ *North-Britain*; an establishment declared
 “ perpetual by the act of union.” *p.* 33.

How did your Bishops, whose end in sitting in parliament is *only* to represent the church, give their suffrage in the act of
 union,

union, consenting thereby that *the pass* before *english* episcopacy should be granted to *scotch* presbytery on the other side the *Tweed*? and yet, was not this one of the most flagrant instances of the alliance of the two societies being formed on the *common principles* of equity and freedom?

It may be proper to examine the *merits* of what you call the church, or what the foundation of her claim to state-favour and protection is. this, you say, with Mr. *W.* “ was her resignation of her sovereignty “ and independency. Of which she could not “ be depriv’d, but by her own voluntary and “ free act. That she did resign this privilege “ in favour of the state.” *p.* 40. what this sovereignty and independency is, that the church resign’d to the state, does not appear either from the alliance, or the exposition. what, or wherein does the right of *supremacy* consist, which the church has so willingly resigned to the state? has the church hereby enabled the civil magistracy by new modelling civil laws, to restrain, and punish sin, *as such*? this you will not allow, “ for, as “ things now stand, ’tis the *crime* and not “ the *sin*, which is properly consider’d by “ them; or they proportion and adjust their “ punishments to the effects of actions, merely as they affect the peace and welfare of “ the state.” *p.* 15. so that the Magistrate has acquired no additional or new power of punishing or rewarding, by this resignation
which

which the church has made.—I would then ask, had the church here in *England* ever any such thing as a right of independency and supremacy? and when was the time of her resignation.

Farther, you say in your exposition, “ That
 “ you find both State and Church actually
 “ possessed of such powers, as do not pro-
 “ perly belong to them; or to which they
 “ have no natural, immediate, and inherent
 “ right.” *p.* 58. And you mention the church
 constituting the Magistrate her supreme head.
 at the same time, “ you find her possessed
 “ of temporal, coactive power, to which she
 “ could have no pretence, or even shadow
 “ of pretence, in her natural and indepen-
 “ dent state.” *p.* 59. which, you think, shews
 the reality of the *alliance* in question.

But how will this chimerical representa-
 tion satisfy any man, who wants to know the
meaning of these things? what fitness, equity,
 or justice is there in them? *Truth* is exclud-
 ed from being the basis of the establishment;
Religion itself is denied any place in the idea
 of the civil magistrate, as the reason of his
 favour and protection: the *Clergy* are only
 considered by him as a *public order in the*
state: and you “ take the liberty to add,
 “ that if the Magistrate do not assign it on
 “ this score, he cannot on the principles of
 “ equity and justice assign it at all.” *p.* 72.

I freely own, that I am profoundly igno-
 rant of the principles of the orthodox scheme,
 and

and of your exposition; if the *church* you are pleading for, from your own description of its alliance, can be considered in any other light whatever, but merely as a *creature of the State*.

You are conscious that the term, *church*, when it has a religious sense, is not capable of any human establishment. both the *alliance* and *exposition* betray this apprehension of the impossibility: which has led you to the scandalous distinction of *Truth* and *Utility*. For in religion, Sir, they are eternally inseparable. And hence what you have observ'd from the alliance, is not capable of any defence, *viz.* " that the Church; in her natural and independent State, has no claim to the protection of the civil power; and therefore cannot but be disposed to resign her independency, and enter into an alliance with the State, upon reasonable and proper motives," *p.* 70. what an adept must you be in sophistry, who can talk of reasonable and proper motives to such alliance, after you have stripped your church bare of all that is virtuous and valuable, by taking away from her *truth* and *religion*.

Yet this assertion of yours is false in fact; as well as from some propositions both in the alliance and in the exposition. for if the *church* be justly defin'd, as distinct from civil society, it must denote a *society of faithful men, who fear God and work righteousness*. now such society has a claim to civil protection, from the very nature and end of civil government.

government. You cite the *Bishop of London* insisting upon it, “ that the Magistrate has
 “ no right to punish any one in his fortune,
 “ or even exclude him from civil power,
 “ on account of his religion.” *p.* 51.

The *Protestant-dissenters*, if allow’d to be capable of religious character, may be, and are a part of the Church of Christ, as truly as any other men under the heavens. *i. e.* if they support that character. They therefore must be consider’d as *the Church*, in a religious sense ; because they have not resigned their independency, neither have entered into an alliance with the state : and yet, they have a claim to the protection of the state, and do actually enjoy that protection. You must allow this, *Sir*, though they acknowledge no supreme, legislative authority in their religious character, but that *only* of Jesus.

You are aware of this, and say, “ the
 “ Question is, whether the supremacy of the
 “ Magistrate be a real *disgrace* to a national
 “ church professing its faith in Jesus ; and an
 “ invasion of the natural and proper rights
 “ of the Church of Christ.” *p.* 73. But then, you trample upon the difficulty thus : “ If
 “ indeed we can prove, that the Magistrate
 “ actually derives this power from the Church ;
 “ and that the Church has conferred it upon
 “ him, on reasonable and proper motives ; this
 “ will come up to the point in question,
 “ for what ground will then remain, to in-
 “ sult and reproach the Church for pa-
 D “ with

“ with her independency, if she has resign’d
 “ it upon reasonable and proper terms? And
 “ who hath proved she hath done so, but
 “ the author of *the alliance between Church*
 “ *and State?*” p. 84.

This is such a piece of profound reasoning, that a person of profound ignorance may discover the fallacy of. For the church of Christ having but *one* head and Lord, and he in heaven; never was in a state of independency on this its head, any more than a natural body can be independent on its natural head. consequently the *Church of Christ* never had a power of resigning, or transferring the supremacy of its head. This will and must ever remain the same, however men, who are called by you the *Church*, fancy themselves in alliance with the state, from a resignation of their independency. Indeed it is possible for any number of men, who profess to believe in Christ; to disavow the authority and binding force of his laws, and call other men *Lords*, and *Masters*; and be under their edicts and prescriptions. But this must be their own voluntary act; and it may be done from worldly considerations: yet, by no means can such men be said to own no other Law-giver but Jesus.—the churches in alliance, by your system, don’t resign their *independency* on Jesus, but their *dependency*: and they put themselves out of a religious, into a civil State.—

The Protestant-dissenter then is not chargeable with holding a notion that implies an *Im-*
perium

perium in Imperio, an empire within an empire tho' you say it. *p.* 84. But it is this *orthodox-system* that is chargeable; by pretending to profess faith in Jesus, at the same time the Church has resigned her independency; and conferred a *supremacy* upon the civil magistrate.

If a man, whom you *brand* with profound ignorance may inform you, the *Protestant-dissenter*, who is consistent in his spirit with the principles of his dissent, envies you not the emoluments your Church enjoys, upon the terms of your alliance. He knows, that Christ's Kingdom is not of this world. That the *riches* and *honours* of the world are no part of the reward of Christ's subject. He knows that the friendship of the world is *enmity* with God. His religion consists in righteousness, peace, and joy. He is clothed with humility. And he is crucifying the world with its affections and lusts.

So that by a citation you have made from Dr. *Stebbing*, *p.* 53. it must be a truth, " that, that which prejudices men against
" the faith, is commonly some *worldly interest* or other which presents itself in opposition to it. That there are very few
" who reject or depart from the truth through
" the fault of their understandings, comparatively to the number of those who are
" led aside by the prevalency of their *fleshly appetites*." From whence you justly infer, " whatever may be the case of some particulars, it will, I think, be difficult to

“ prove that the body of the several sects
 “ is tempted to continue in its separation, by
 “ any *secular or worldly interest* whatsoever.”

In this declaration you have unanswerably acquitted the body of the several sects from worldly motives in their separation. And so far they are secure of the most manifest *criterion* of their belonging to the Church of Christ; since *they are not of the world, even as their Lord was not of the world.*

Hence forward, you, and all other Church-defenders, may excuse yourselves the trouble of, *recovering the Protestant-dissenters to the Bosom of the Church*, which you so ardently wish, p. 57. Since your Church has no one advantage over ours, except you reckon upon *titles of honour, temporal dignities, riches, and worldly power.* All which our Church disclaims. And you yourself own, that your Church could not be considered as a religious society, in her obtaining the alliance.

But then, for what reason do you stigmatize and reproach them as *enemies* to the church? is it because they are obliged by their religion, not to love the world, nor the things of it; which you have obtained by a resignation of your independency and supremacy? Be it so; the prize is your own. For a Protestant-dissenter, as a consistent Christian cannot resign or transfer the supremacy of his *one* Lord. It is then their not being influenced by worldly motives in their separation, that is the *infectious dislemper* which makes your
 test-

test-law necessary to keep them out of your family? *p. 44. note.* “That *law*’s being
 “merely a Security to the Church from
 “those who would destroy it,” is but an
 imaginary reason of it, whilst the dissenting
 body preserve their virtue; or remain separatists
 upon no worldly principle, which you have al-
 ready allow’d they do.—no danger can take
 place. Yet I must ask you, Sir, how you can
 reconcile the Bishop of *London*’s opinion with
 your defence of the *test-law*? an account of
 which you give us, with your approbation of it,
 “My Lord of *London* himself agrees to this
 “idea of the Magistrate’s office; yet insists,
 “that the Magistrate has no right to punish
 “any one in his fortune, or even exclude
 “him from civil power, on account of his
 “religion.”

How will you make it appear that the
 Magistrate has no right to exclude any one
 from civil power, on account of his religion,
 whilst you defend the *Test-law*, which in its
 very nature and design does exclude men from
 civil power, on no other account than that of
 their not being of your *church*? —

You have affirmed, “that the *test-law* is
 “necessary, as the peace and tranquility of
 “the public, both in Church and State, would
 “be greatly endanger’d, without some pro-
 “vision of this kind. — and that diversity
 “of Sects in the public administration, would
 “be a real evil.” — *p. 64. 65.* But is this
 consistent with my Lord of *London*’s insist-
 ing

ing upon it, that the Magistrate has no right to exclude any one from civil power, on account of his religion? — were the characters of men canvass'd, and thoroughly known that have been and are in the administration of civil power, under the subsistence of the *Test-law*, I am persuaded, greater danger to the peace and tranquility of the public could not be apprehended from the repeal of it. Are there not as profligate and abandon'd men occupying spheres of influence in the civil administration, as are to be found among those whom the *Test-law* excludes? I am persuaded there are. And as different in religious and political sentiment too: even so different that christians and unbelievers; *loyalists* and known *Jacobites*, are admitted. Difference of religious opinion cannot, in the least be prevented, by an establishment and a test-law; as I have shewn more at large in the *Comment*. And yet the Church is not alarm'd with the danger of the public peace and tranquility being disturb'd! so that you may see, *Sir*, that the reasonings of the Alliance and Exposition, as well as those of your other church-writers, have no foundation in truth.

The *Test-law* you imagine necessary to secure the *Church-Establishment*. Why so? you have not the least reason to suppose that the Government will neglect to avail itself of all those important advantages, which you are confident you have demonstrated to arise

from the alliance between Church and State. You need not be afraid — no Protestant-dissenter preserving his virtue will hurt you. he is not a more obnoxious animal, than those of your own church. His principles will lead him to loyalty, to peace, and to do all he can to serve the interest of truth and liberty.

Speak out, Mr. Expositor, and let the world know, what are those inestimable jewels of independency and supremacy, that your Church has resigned to the State.—How she became possessed of them,—what was the use she made of them before the resignation,—and make it appear that the privilege which the state has gain'd by that resignation is a *quantum meruit*. hereby you will do honour both to the state and your church.

Upon the whole, the laugh at your system, is not void of *grace* ; since one is not able to consider your Establishment under the idea of a national *religious* institution. For as to the principle of *truth*, you ask, “ what is it “ but an *awkward prop* in the old system, “ which effectually undetermines one side of “ the edifice, while it only bears up the “ other in imagination.” *p.* 36. *Truth* will not serve either the Church or the State in your system. And *religion* is quite unfit to become a principle of the alliance.

And yet, panegyric is bestow'd with a liberal hand upon the book of alliance, and its incomparable author. *Merit* is ascribed to him at the expence of the credit of the alliance itself, and that of all its defenders. For hav-
ing

ing mentioned the Church's resigning her *independency* upon reasonable and proper terms; you ask, " who hath proved she hath done " so, but the author of the alliance between " Church and State?" *p.* 84.

But is it not incredible, that this *public contract*, which church-men have long rav'd about, and swell'd in their boastings of the church's claims, should never be entered into, nor understood, till Mr. *W.* made the discovery? And which, probably, had been the scandal even of his attempt, but for the profound knowledge he had acquired of the *Esoteric* doctrine of the antients.

You might well " not wonder, that the " author should chuse to leave this work " *as a monument of his love to his Country*; " or that the finest genius of the age,—— " should with satisfaction and pleasure, see " it address'd to him, as to one who understood the *principles* best, and had the " *consequences* most at heart." The elegant, the sublime finishing period of the Exposition.

But good Mr. *Layman*, did Lord *Chesterfield* understand the principles of the alliance before your *Apollo* made the discovery? If he did, and had the consequences most at heart, how will you account for his not disclosing them to the public? If *his Lordship* and the world owe the discovery entirely to your *Apollo*, how did he understand them at all? If not till the book of alliance came forth, how know you, that he understood them best?

And

And are there no Churchmen who have the consequences *more* at heart than that noble Lord? can you prove it to be any *shade* cast on the lustre of his genius, that he has *less* at heart the consequences of the orthodox principles than you have, or than the author of the alliance?

However I will place before you the sentiments of a genius, to which I am persuaded, that *noble Lord* will vail; and confess an incompetency of judgment in the comparison: I mean, Sir, one *Jesus*, the only lord of the Christian-church, who in his prayer, says, “ I
 “ have given them thy word: and the world
 “ hath hated them, because they are not of
 “ the world. I pray not that thou shouldest
 “ take them out of the world, but that thou
 “ shouldest keep them from the evil. They
 “ are not of the world, even as I am not of
 “ the world. Sanctify them by thy truth,
 “ thy word is truth.”

The task therefore which devolves upon the expositor, is, to shew the public what *concord* there is between the doctrine of this prayer, and the orthodox system. If you do this, or can shew any countenance given to your Church-establishment in the gospel, I will answer for the addition of one member to your Society.

Till then, the calm satisfaction I enjoy in my *dissent*, is not in any danger of being unsettled or discomposed by the attempts you are making to defend your alliance.

As I am closing this letter ; be assured, that your *calumny* has not ruffled the peace of my mind. I attribute the *rancour* only to the pride and malice of your spirit. — you have my *pity*. if you *repent*, you have my *pardon*.

One word more of consolation, and *adieu*. despair not of the influence of those principles, on which you build the alliance. They are not the *less*, but the *more* popular as they exclude *truth* and *religion* ! and in the eye of the world, you may depend upon it, they will certainly have the force of demonstration. — would you have more ?

I am,

the author of the Comment, &c.